

JOHN L. BURRIS, Esq./ State Bar #69888  
BENJAMIN NISENBAUM, Esq./ State Bar #222173  
LAW OFFICES OF JOHN L. BURRIS  
Airport Corporate Centre  
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 1120  
Oakland, California 94621  
Telephone: (510) 839-5200  
Facsimile: (510) 839-3882

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PATRICIA DESANTIS, individually and as Successor in Interest for RICHARD DESANTIS, deceased, and as Guardian Ad Litem for DANI DESANTIS, a minor, and TIMOTHY FARRELL, a minor,

Case No. C 07 3386 JSW (consolidated with  
Case No. C 07 04474)

**PLAINTIFF ADRIANNE DESANTIS'  
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'  
OBJECTION AND MOTION TO STRIKE  
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

**Plaintiffs,**

vs.

CITY OF SANTA ROSA, JERRY SOARES,  
RICH CELLI, TRAVIS MENKE, PATRICIA  
MANN and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive,

#### Defendants.

ADRIANNE DESANTIS,  
Plaintiffs,

vs.

CITY OF SANTA ROSA, a municipal corporation; EDWIN FLINT, in his capacity as Chief of Police for the CITY OF SANTA ROSA; PATRICIA MANN, individually, and in her capacity as an officer for the CITY OF SANTA ROSA; RICH CELLI, individually and in his capacity as an officer for the CITY OF SANTA ROSA; TRAVIS MENKE, individually and in his capacity as an officer; and DOES 1-25, inclusive, individually and in their capacities as officers for the CITY OF SANTA ROSA,  
Defendants

1 Plaintiff ADRIANNE DESANTIS hereby opposes Defendants' Objection and Motion to  
2 Strike her Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, as follows:  
3

4 **1. PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION WAS TIMELY FILED UNDER LOCAL RULE 7-3**

5 Defendants assert in their Objection, without factual basis, "plaintiff's opposition was not  
6 timely filed and defendants did not have an opportunity to review said opposition before filing their  
7 reply." (Defendants Objection, page 1, lines 25-26). Plaintiffs Opposition was filed electronically  
8 (through the Court's ECF service) on September 26, 2008.

9  
10 October 17, 2008 is the date set to hear the Motion for Summary Judgment against Plaintiff  
11 Adrienne DeSantis. Northern District Local Rule 7-3 governs the filing of Oppositions, Reply, and  
12 Supplemental Material. Local Rule 7-3(a), Opposition, states: "Any opposition to a motion must be  
13 served and filed not less than 21 days before the hearing date." September 26, 2008 is exactly 21 days  
14 before the hearing date of October 17, 2008.  
15

16 On its face, Defendants' objection is frivolous under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11(b),  
17 which requires that pleadings, written motions, or other papers filed with the Court by an attorney are  
18 warranted by existing law and nonfrivolous argument. Defendants assert no basis to hold Plaintiff  
19 Adrienne DeSantis to a different timeline other than that imposed by Locale Rule 7-3.  
20

21 There is also no prejudice suffered by Defendants, who continue to have the opportunity to  
22 respond to Plaintiff Adrienne DeSantis Opposition appropriately by Reply brief.  
23

24 **2. PLAINTIFF ADRIANNE DESANTIS WAS NOT A PARTY TO THE COURT'S  
25 AUGUST 20, 2008 ORDER SETTING THE BRIEFING SCHEDULE ON  
26 PLAINTIFF PATRICIA DESANTIS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT  
AND DEFENDANTS' CROSS-MOTION AND OPPOSITION TO PATRICIA  
DESGANTIS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.**

27 Although unstated in their objection, it may be Defendants' position that Plaintiff  
28 ADRIANNE DESANTIS is bound to the modifications in the Order to Amend the briefing schedule

1 on Plaintiff PATRICIA DESANTIS' Motion for summary judgment. If that is Defendants' position,  
 2 as it appears to be from their reply as to the motions filed in the *Patricia DeSantis* matter, it is  
 3 logically unsound and factually unsupported.

4 First, Plaintiff ADRIANNE DESANTIS was not a party to, and did not join Plaintiff  
 5 PATRICIA DESANTIS' Motion for Summary Judgment. The stipulation to amend the briefing  
 6 schedule was entered into only between the Defendants and the Plaintiffs in *Patricia DeSantis, et al.*  
 7 Case no. C 07 3386 JSW (Document No. 50). Plaintiff ADRIANNE DESANTIS made no agreement  
 8 to alter or amend the normal course of briefing established by Local Rule 7-3. The Court's Order on  
 9 that stipulation refers only to Defendants' cross-motion and opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for  
 10 Summary Judgment in one brief (which was not filed on behalf of Adrienne DeSantis), Plaintiffs'  
 11 Opposition to Defendants' Motion and reply in support of their motion (also in one brief). The  
 12 Court's Order does not reflect any alteration to the briefing schedule as to Plaintiff *Adrienne*  
 13 *DeSantis*.

14 Additionally, Defendants did not argue in their Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment the  
 15 cause of action that pertains to Plaintiff Adrienne DeSantis, which consists of a violation of Adrienne  
 16 DeSantis' Fourteenth Amendment right to familial relationship with her son, Decedent Richard  
 17 DeSantis. Defendants argued that there is no municipal liability, no Fourth Amendment violation,  
 18 and qualified immunity. Plaintiff Adrienne DeSantis has never asserted a Fourth Amendment  
 19 violation in this case. Her cause of action under the Fourteenth Amendment is distinct from the  
 20 Fourth Amendment violation asserted by Plaintiff Patricia DeSantis.

21 Plaintiff Adrienne DeSantis has properly defended any Motion for Summary Judgment filed  
 22 against her, even though it is arguable that a Motion for Summary Judgment was ever properly made  
 23 against Adrienne DeSantis.

24 Defendants' objection should be overruled.

25 **Respectfully submitted,**

26 Dated: October 1, 2008

27 The Law Offices of John L. Burris



28 Ben Nisenbaum  
Attorney for Plaintiffs